

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application as amended. Claims 1-41 are pending in the application. Claims 1-5, 14, 15, 19, 20, 24, 34 and 35 have been amended. Claims 42-46 have been added. No claims have been canceled.

Applicants have amended claim 5 to correct a minor typing error. No new matter has been added. The Examiner is respectfully requested to enter the amendment.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 9, and 14-18 under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by Stirling (Stirling, "Mobile Multimedia Platform", IEEE VTS 52nd Edition, 9/24/2000). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections and submits with the current response a declaration under 37 C.F.R. §1.131 to swear behind Stirling to remove Stirling as a reference based on previous invention. Therefore, the rejections have been overcome. Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 6-8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Stirling in view of Lee et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,374,177). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejections.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Stirling in view of Kikinis (U.S. Patent No. 6,055,566). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1. The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejections.

The Examiner rejected claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Stirling in view of Obradovich (U.S. Patent No. 6,542,794). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1. The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejections.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 12-13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Stirling in view of Berberich et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,703,734). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1. The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejections.

The Examiner rejected claims 19-24, 28, 29, and 34-41 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Stirling in view of Groeger et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,923,624). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1. The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejections.

The Examiner rejected claims 25-27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being anticipated by Stirling in view of Groeger, and further in view of Lee. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1. The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejections.

The Examiner rejected claim 30 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Stirling in view of Groeger, and further in view of Kikinis. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1. The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejections.

The Examiner rejected claim 31 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Stirling in view of Groeger, and further in view of Obradovich. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1. The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejections.

The Examiner rejected claims 32-33 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Stirling in view of Groeger, and further in view of Berberich. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1. The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejections.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) and §103(a) have been overcome by the remarks and withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested. Applicant submits that claims 1-41 as amended and claims 42-46 as added are now in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: 8/14 2003

C7
Chui-ku Teresa Wong
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 48,042

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on 8/14/03.

Juanita Briscoe
Juanita Briscoe

8/14/03
Date